

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3 and 5-33 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 18, 20, and 21 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [0041] of the present Specification.

Claim 4 has been previously cancelled.

Claim 34 has been added. Support for the newly-added claim can be found in at least paragraph [0017] of the present Specification.

Applicants thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephonic interview, which was conducted on September 30, 2009.

Claims Objections

Claims 5-17 are objected to because of informalities in Claim 5. Appropriate correction has been made to Claim 5 in order to correct a typographical error. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Terminal Disclaimer

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,287,041. While Applicants do not wish to file a terminal disclaimer at this time, Applicants will file a terminal disclaimer in the future, if needed.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 5-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,778,651 (“Jost”) in view of Thornberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,742,588 (“Thornberg”) and in further view of Riley et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123983 (“Riley”). While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Jost, Thornberg, and Riley, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of amended independent Claims 1, 18, and 20. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Jost, Thornberg, and Riley, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “creating a service request object with the service request information, wherein the first source computerized service request management system and a target computerized service request management system reference the service request object during a course of a resolution of a service request” Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [0041] of the present Specification. As discussed during the aforementioned telephonic interview, the Examiner indicated that subject matter contained within at least paragraph [0041] is distinguishable over the cited references.

For example, Jost discusses accepting service order requests in various formats from service order sources, converting the service order requests into a single internal format, and subsequently sending provisioning information to network elements in the form of messages.

See, Abstract, Jost. Thornberg discusses managing packet switched traffic on a cellular communications network. *See, Abstract, Thornberg.* Riley discusses providing and measuring the performance of a service desk for providing service to customers. *See, Abstract, Riley.* However, nothing in the cited passages of Jost, Thornberg, and Riley, taken alone or in any permissible combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests any sort of creation of an object (much less a service request object, as claimed) with captured service request information and that object is referenced by both a source and target service request management system during the resolution of a service request. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claims 1, 18, and 20, and all claims dependent therefrom are patentable over the cited passages of Jost, Thornberg, and Riley, taken alone or in any permissible combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost in view of Starkovich et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,111,077 (“Starkovich”) in view of Thornberg and in even further view of Riley and in even further view of official notice. While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed. Starkovich is not cited as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting any of the elements of dependent Claim 3. Thus, dependent Claims 3 is patentable over the cited passages of Jost and Starkovich, taken alone or in any permissible combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald S. Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 64,170
Telephone: (512) 439-5086
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099